

Before The  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JUL 15 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the	)	WT Docket No. 96-18
Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future	)	
Development of Paging Systems	)	
	)	
Implementation of Section 309(j)	)	PP Docket No. 93-253
of the Communications Act --	)	
Competitive Bidding	)	

**COMMENTS AND OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OF MOBILEMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

MobileMedia Communications, Inc. ("*MobileMedia*"), the parent company of MobileMedia Paging, Inc. and Mobile Communications Corporation of America ("*MobileComm*"),<sup>1/</sup> hereby submits Comments and Opposition to Petitions for Reconsideration regarding the Commission's First Report and Order (the "*First Report and Order*")<sup>2/</sup> in the above-captioned docket. First, MobileMedia opposes petitioners who have requested that the Commission grant nationwide exclusivity to additional parties who had not yet completed construction of their nationwide networks as of the date on which the Commission adopted its Notice of Proposed Rule Making in the above-captioned docket. Second, MobileMedia supports several parties who favor curtailing the ability of numerous third parties to file mutually-exclusive applications to applications for expansion. Finally,

---

<sup>1/</sup> MobileMedia, MobileComm and their subsidiaries comprise the second-largest paging company in the United States, with more than four million units in service. The companies provide service in all 50 states, offering subscribers local, regional and nationwide paging and other wireless messaging services.

<sup>2/</sup> FCC 96-183 (released April 23, 1996).

MobileMedia believes that the Commission should restrict its exception for processing 929 MHz applications filed prior to February 8, 1996 to those filed by true incumbents.

I.     NATIONWIDE EXCLUSIVITY SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED TO APPLICANTS THAT HAVE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED CONSTRUCTION OF THEIR INITIAL NETWORKS

The Personal Communications Industry Association ("PCIA") has urged the Commission to grant nationwide exclusivity to licensees who had not yet completed construction of the requisite number of facilities for nationwide exclusivity as of the February 8, 1996 adoption date of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in this proceeding.<sup>3/</sup> It would be bad public policy to grant nationwide exclusivity to applicants who have, in some cases, done nothing but file applications and, in any event, have failed to meet construction requirements for a nationwide license. Such applicants were never guaranteed any special status; they were simply given the opportunity to build out their networks to meet requirements for nationwide exclusivity. Unlike others who undertook prompt construction of nationwide networks, these firms elected not to do so. The Emergency Petition for Reconsideration of TSR Paging Inc., filed May 6, 1996 (as supplemented on May 14, 1996 and May 23, 1996), simply bemoans the Commission's failure to grant TSR Paging a nationwide license; it fails to offer any substantive reason why applicants who have yet to build out their networks should be awarded nationwide licenses. Some applicants for nationwide exclusivity were long ago granted the opportunity to achieve nationwide exclusivity and have had up to two years to build out their networks. For

---

<sup>3/</sup> See PCIA Petition for Partial Reconsideration, filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

example, one licensee who was coordinated for nationwide exclusivity in 1994 has yet to build a single base station even though its grant has expiration dates beyond February 8, 1996. It clearly should not be eligible for nationwide exclusivity. These applicants have had ample opportunity to construct; having failed to build out their networks to achieve nationwide licenses, they should now compete for licenses in whatever licensing scheme the Commission may adopt in this proceeding. At a minimum, the Commission should analyze each prospective licensee's progress in building out networks and grant exclusivity only to those applicants that have made substantial progress in the construction of nationwide networks.

## II. ONLY BONA FIDE COMPETING APPLICANTS SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO FILE COMPETING EXPANSION APPLICATIONS

MobileMedia supports the numerous parties who seek to curtail the abilities of third parties to file competing applications against *bona fide* expansion applications.<sup>4/</sup> The ability of incumbent licensees actually to expand their systems is limited by the abilities of numerous other parties to file mutually-exclusive applications against the initial expansion application and thus effectively block the *bona fide* applicant from expanding its system. Under the Commission's proposed rules, any other party, no matter how *bona fide* its

---

<sup>4/</sup> The Commission's recently-introduced change in the cut-off date for eligibility of applicants seeking expansion of their paging systems is the most reasonable solution to resolving which applicants should be able to expand their systems. The amended cut-off to applications on file as of September 30, 1995 is reasonable; applicants who submitted applications after such date could not reasonably have expected grants prior to February 8, 1996 (the previously-selected cut-off based on the actual application grants).

interest in developing a paging system, can file a competing application.<sup>5/</sup> As numerous other parties have argued, "[b]y imposing absolutely no limits on "[mutually-exclusive]" filings, the [First Report and Order] encourages speculative and extortionate filings while offering no rationale as to why these filings are necessary."<sup>6/</sup> The Commission simply states that it seeks, "to prevent any possible prejudice to parties with a potential interest in the channel."<sup>7/</sup> However, such proposal takes away the very thing which the Commission sought to allow, the ability of incumbent licensees to expand their systems during the freeze, for the Commission will hold all mutually-exclusive applications, including of course the initial expansion application, in abeyance until the conclusion of this proceeding. While the purpose of the expansion filing rights is to allow existing licensees to meet customer needs, the granting to any party the ability to file against such application appears to have no justification. The Commission has the authority to set licensee eligibility standards and has indeed used such authority to limit the class of potential initial applicants for expansion.<sup>8/</sup> The Commission should likewise restrict the class of potential competing filers to incumbent co-channel licensees.

---

<sup>5/</sup> Order on Reconsideration of First Report and Order, WT Docket 96-18, PP Docket No. 93-253 (released June 11, 1996).

<sup>6/</sup> Petition for Partial Reconsideration of ProNet, Inc., filed June 10, 1996, at 5; *see also* Petition for Clarification and/or Partial Reconsideration of Interim Licensing Rules, filed June 6, 1996, at 3-5; Petition for Partial Reconsideration of Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens, filed June 6, 1996, at 5; Petition for Reconsideration of Paging Network, Inc., filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

<sup>7/</sup> *See* First Report and Order, ¶ 26.

<sup>8/</sup> *See* Petition for Clarification And/or Partial Reconsideration of Interim Licensing Rules of Ameritech, filed June 6, 1996 (citing *U.S. v. Storer Broadcasting*, 351 U.S. 192 (1956)).

### III. THE COMMISSION'S PROCESSING OF 929 MHZ APPLICATIONS SHOULD APPLY ONLY TO BUILT-OUT INCUMBENTS

The Commission states that only 929 MHz PCP exclusive applications filed by incumbents on or before February 8, 1996 and which are not mutually exclusive, will be processed.<sup>9/</sup> Diamond Page argues that the Commission should include applicants like themselves, who have never built out their systems and indeed do not currently operate any PCP systems, within the definition of "incumbent."<sup>10/</sup> This is merely an attempt to gain an unjustified exemption from whatever licensing and auction scheme the Commission adopts for the paging industry. The Commission's interim licensing policy is intended to allow incumbent operators to add service to meet customer requirements. Obviously, parties such as Diamond Page, which have no PCP operations or customers, are beyond the scope of that policy. At bottom, Diamond Page and others similarly situated are not incumbents and there is no policy reason to treat them as such.

### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should further modify its partial freeze by curtailing the ability of third parties to file competing applications against *bona fide*

---

<sup>9/</sup> See First Report and Order, ¶ 42.

<sup>10/</sup> See Petition for Clarification or Reconsideration of Diamond Page Partnership, AmericaOne Partnership, and affiliated entities (collectively, "Diamond Page"), filed June 10, 1996, at 3.

expansion applications and by clarifying its definition of "incumbent" for purposes of defining which 929 MHz PCP applications should be processed during the pendency of the freeze.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald A. Fishman

Kevin C. Boyle  
Donald A. Fishman  
LATHAM & WATKINS  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1300  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2505  
(202) 637-2200

Attorneys for MobileMedia Communications, Inc.

Gene P. Belardi  
Vice President  
MobileMedia Communications, Inc.  
2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 935  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
(703) 312-5152

Dated: July 15, 1996

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Donald A. Fishman, hereby certify that on this 15th day of July, 1996, copies of COMMENTS AND OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MOBILEMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC. were hand-carried or mailed to the following individuals:

Chairman Reed E. Hundt  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 814  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Jackie Chorney  
Legal Assistant to Chairman Reed Hundt  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 838G  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner James H. Quello  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Rudolfo M. Baca  
Legal Advisor to Commissioner Quello  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 826  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Lisa Smith  
Senior Legal Advisor to Commissioner Barrett  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 826  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Susan Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. David Siddall  
Legal Advisor to Commissioner Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 802  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 844  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Susan Toller  
Legal Advisor to Commissioner Chong  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 844  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Michelle Farquhar  
Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Gerald P. Vaughan  
Deputy Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ms. Rosalind K. Allen  
Associate Bureau Chief  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554



Mr. David Furth  
Chief of Commercial Wireless Division  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
2025 M Street, N.W., Suite 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Timothy E. Welch  
Hill & Welch  
Suite #113  
1330 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Henry A. Solomon  
Melodie A. Virtue  
Haley Bader & Potts  
Amelia L. Brown  
Suite 900  
4350 North Fairfax Drive  
Arlington, VA 222303-1633

Caressa D. Bennet  
Michael R. Bennet  
Bennet & Bennet  
1831 Ontario Place, NW Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20009

George Y. Wheeler  
Koteen & Naftalin  
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Thomas Gutierrez, Esq.  
J. Justin McClure, Esq.  
David L. Nace  
George L. Lyon, Jr.  
Pamela L. Gist  
Pamela Gaary  
Elizabeth R. Sachs  
Terry J. Romine  
Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierrez  
1111 19th Street, N.W. 12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20036

Harold Mordkofsky  
John A. Prendergast  
Richard D. Rubino  
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson  
& Dickens  
2120 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dennis L. Myers  
Ameritech Mobile Services, Inc.  
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive  
Location 3H78  
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195-5000

Laura H. Phillips  
Christina H. Burrow  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson  
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036

Larry Shaefer  
SMR Systems, Inc.  
4212 Mt. Vernon  
Houston, TX 77006

Ellen S. Mandell  
Pepper & Corazzine  
200 Montgomery Building  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20006

Phillip L. Spector  
Thomas A. Boasberg  
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind,  
Wharton & Garrison  
1615 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

David L. Hill  
Audrey P. Rasmussen  
O'Connor & Hannan  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20006

Katherine M. Holden  
Wiley, Rein & Fielding  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Lucille M. Mates  
140 New Montgomery Street, Rm. 1526  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Margaret E. Garber  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Kenneth E. Hardman  
Moir & Hardman  
200 L Street, N.W., Suite 512  
Washington, DC 20036

Lisa M. Zaina  
OPASTCO  
21 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

Joe D. Edge  
Tina M. Pidgeon  
Drinker Biddle & Reath  
901 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Robert H. Schwaninger, Jr.  
Brown & Schwaninger  
1835 K Street, N.W., Suite 650  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Veronica M. Ahern  
Nixon, Hargrave, Devans & Doyle  
One Thomas Circle  
Washington, DC 20005

David Jatlow, Esq.  
Young & Jatlow  
2300 N Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20037

Carl W. Northrop Esq.  
Christine M. Crowe, Esq.  
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker  
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Tenth Floor  
Washington, DC 20004

Mark J. Golden  
Personal Communications  
Industry Association  
500 Montgomery Street, Suite 700  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Judith St. Ledger-Roty  
Stefan M. Lopatkiewicz  
Paul G. Madison  
Reed Smith Shaw McClay  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100-East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005

Jill Albeshouse Stern  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

Daniel E. Smith  
Jerome K. Blask  
Gurman, Blask & Freedman  
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Dallas Vanderhoof  
TeleBEEPER of New Mexico, Inc.  
P.O. Box 25161  
Albuquerque, NM 87125

Lawrence M. Miller  
Schwartz, Woods & Miller  
1350 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20036

Robert R. Rule  
Rule Radiophone Service, Inc.  
2232 Dell Range Boulevard  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009

Frederick M. Joyce  
Christine McLaughlin  
Joyce & Jacobs  
1019 19th Street, N.W.  
14th Floor, PH-2  
Washington, DC 20036

William Ciuffo  
John Roussos  
John Sieber  
Comp Comm, Inc.  
One Echelon Plaza, Suite 100  
227 Laurel Road  
Voorhees, NJ 08043

Lloyd D. Huffman  
Huffman Communications  
2829 W. 7th Ave Boz 1753  
Corsicana, TX 7151

William J. Franklin  
1200 G Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20005


Richard S. Becker  
James S. Finerfrock  
Jeffrey E. Rummel  
Richard S. Becker & Associates  
1915 Eye Street, N.W, 8th Floor  
Washington, DC 20006

John L. Crump  
ACE Communications  
11403 Waples Mill Road  
Post Office Box 3070  
Oakton, VA 22124

Mary McDermott  
Linda Kent  
Charles D. Cosson  
U.S. Telephone Association  
1401 H Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005

A. Thomas Carroccio  
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd  
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

William L. Fishman, Esq.  
Sullivan & Worcester LLP  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20036

  
Donald A. Fishman